

United States Court of Appeals
For the Eighth Circuit

No. 24-3314

Milvia Aracely Perez Lopez De Hernandez; E.A.P.

Petitioners

v.

Pamela Bondi, Attorney General of the United States

Respondent

Petition for Review of an Order of the
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted: April 2, 2026

Filed: April 3, 2026

[Unpublished]

Before LOKEN, GRUENDER, and KOBES, Circuit Judges.

PER CURIAM.

Guatemalan citizens Milvia Aracely Perez Lopez De Hernandez and E.A.P., her minor child, petition for review of an order of the Board of Immigration Appeals (BIA). An immigration judge denied Perez Lopez De Hernandez's application for

asylum and withholding of removal, and the BIA dismissed her appeal from that decision.¹

We conclude substantial evidence supports the agency’s determination that Perez Lopez De Hernandez’s membership in her proposed particular social groups was not a “central reason” for the harm she suffered or feared. *See* 8 U.S.C. §§ 1158(b)(1)(B)(i) (setting out the “one central reason” nexus standard), 1101(a)(42)(A) (defining “refugee”); *Silvestre-Giron v. Barr*, 949 F.3d 1114, 1117-19, 1119 n.3 (8th Cir. 2020) (explaining that this court deferentially reviews the record as a whole for substantial evidence and will not overturn the agency’s nexus finding unless the record evidence is so compelling that no reasonable factfinder could fail to find in her favor); *see also Aguilar-Hernandez v. Bondi*, 163 F.4th 537, 539-40 (8th Cir. 2026). To the extent she argues that the BIA failed to properly review the immigration judge’s factual findings or failed to provide sufficient reasoning in its decision for appellate review, we find those arguments to be without merit. *See, e.g., Averianova v. Holder*, 592 F.3d 931, 936 (8th Cir. 2010); 8 C.F.R. § 1003.1(d)(3)(i)-(ii); *Matter of N-M-*, 25 I. & N. Dec. 526, 532 (BIA 2011). Finally, because her failure to establish a nexus to a protected ground is dispositive of her claims for asylum and withholding of removal, *see Tino v. Garland*, 13 F.4th 708, 710 (8th Cir. 2021) (per curiam), we do not address her other arguments, *see INS v. Bagamasbad*, 429 U.S. 24, 25 (1976) (per curiam); *Silvestre-Giron*, 949 F.3d at 1117.

Accordingly, the petition for review is denied. *See* 8th Cir. R. 47B.

¹E.A.P. was a derivative applicant on Perez Lopez De Hernandez’s asylum application. *See* 8 U.S.C. § 1158(b)(3)(A); *Fuentes v. Barr*, 969 F.3d 865, 868 n.1 (8th Cir. 2020) (per curiam).